

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW</b>		Docket Number (Optional) <b>TSM03-0140</b>
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]  on _____  Signature _____  Typed or printed name _____	Application Number <b>10/619,828</b>	Filed <b>July 15, 2003</b>
	First Named Inventor <b>Sheu, et al.</b>	
	Art Unit <b>2891</b>	Examiner <b>Farahani, Dana</b>

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

applicant/inventor.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*/Thomas J. Meaney/*

Signature

assignee of record of the entire interest.

See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Thomas J. Meaney*

Typed or printed name

attorney or agent of record.

Registration number 41,990

\_\_\_\_\_  
*972-732-1001*

Telephone number

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*September 28, 2007*

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.  
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

\*Total of 1 form is submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants: Sheu, *et al.* Docket No.: TSM03-0140  
Serial No.: 10/619,828 Art Unit: 2891  
Filed: July 15, 2003 Examiner: Farahani, Dana  
For: Self-Aligned MOSFET having an Oxide Region below the Channel

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Dear Sir:

The following Pre-Appeal Brief is submitted for review by a Panel of Examiners (“the Panel”). Claims 1-12 stand rejected under both 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a), as assertedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0074598A1 to Doyle, et al., (hereinafter “*Doyle*”) and combinations of *Doyle* and U.S. Patent No. 4,069,904 to Shaw, et al., (hereinafter “*Shaw*”) and *Doyle* and U.S. Patent No. 6,759,717 to Sagarwala, et al., (hereinafter “*Sagarwala*”). Independent claim 1 is the subject of this pre-appeal request as it pertains to the teachings of *Doyle*. Applicants reserve the right to further argue other claims in an appeal brief.

*1. Issue*

The issue in this request for review is whether *Doyle* discloses “an impurity region within the channel region …”, as required by claim 1, and as asserted by the Examiner in the Final Office Action, dated May 17, 2007, and the Advisory Action, dated August 28, 2007.

*2. Discussion*

In the Examiner’s comments from the Advisory Action, she notes that (1) *Doyle*’s usage of the term “oxidized voids” and other “un-cited” statements in *Doyle* indicate that the voids include at least a portion of an oxide – thus, an impurity region within the channel region; and (2) *Doyle* provides that “oxygen may be implanted” after formation of the device on the substrate, so that even if the oxide impurity is temporary, there is an intermediate form of the device that still reads on the claims.

#### **A. Oxidized Voids**

*Doyle* describes the “oxidized voids” at paragraphs [0036] and [0044] using the same terminology for both. While the Examiner finds that *Doyle*’s use describes that some kind of oxide is formed within or around the voids, Applicant asserts that the context used in *Doyle* supports that the term oxidized void describes the manner in which the voids are formed. *Doyle* states that oxygen ions may “be used in reaction to alter the internal region of the substrate by way of specific volume or thermal expansion differences (e.g., oxidized voids).” ¶¶ [0036] & [0044]. Annealing takes place later which causes the voids to actually form in the substrate. ¶ [0038]. Applicant asserts that oxidized void is a term used to describe the manner in which the voids were formed, and not the make-up of the voids, as asserted by the Examiner. An oxidized void is a void that is formed through the oxidation process.

While the Examiner claims that other language from *Doyle* supports her conclusion, there is, in fact, no other language that would tend to support that an oxidized void would include some kind of oxidized substance. *Doyle* states that the annealing process begins repairing the substrate material, but that these voids then form as a result. There is no disclosure in *Doyle* that indicates any oxidized material remains related to the oxidized voids or surrounding area. Thus, there is no disclosure in *Doyle* that supports the Examiner’s contention. As such, a void, whether an oxidized void or otherwise, is not the same as the impurity region required by claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the teachings in *Doyle*.

#### **B. Intermediate Device**

The Examiner also asserts that *Doyle* describes an intermediate product that reads on claim 1, stating that “*Doyle* states in [0036] that **oxygen** may be implanted after formation of the device on the substrate” such that even if the impurity is temporary, it still constitutes an intermediate product that reads on the claims. Advisory Action, continuation sheet. (emphasis added.) I would note that *Doyle* does **not** state that oxygen is implanted after formation of the device. The direct language from *Doyle* reads, “The **voids** of the present invention may be implanted into the substrate before, during, or after the formation of a device on the substrate.” ¶ [0036] (emphasis added). The Examiner’s mistaken quotation of *Doyle* elicits a misleading conclusion regarding any post-formation operations.

Only one of the examples discussed in *Doyle* describes a process occurring *after* device formation. Figures 13-16 show voids being created in the gate of an NMOS device. However, claim 1 requires the impurity region to be in the channel region, which the gate region is not. Therefore, there is no teaching in *Doyle* that describes any impurity region within the channel in a post-formation process, which would constitute the “intermediate” device asserted by the Examiner. Without any teaching of this alleged intermediate device, the Examiner’s reasoning is unsupported by *Doyle*’s disclosure.

Moreover, there is no disclosure in *Doyle* that indicates where any impurities may be implanted. The specification and Figures from *Doyle* indicate some depths to which the impurities may be implanted, but only show where the voids result. They do not show where the initial substances are implanted. *Doyle* describes that the implanted gases diffuse through the substrate, but there is no indication as to the exact location of the implantation. Thus, *Doyle* also does not show that the implant region is “spaced from the top surface” or “having a first outer boundary that is proximate, but laterally spaced apart from the source region and a second outer boundary proximate, but laterally spaced apart from the drain region.” The void depicted in Figure 17 appears to be located in the correct position. However, as discussed above, a void is not an impurity region.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Panel to reverse the Examiner’s rejections of claims 1-12.

Respectfully submitted,

---

September 28, 2007  
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
Tel.: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218

---

/Thomas J. Meaney/  
Thomas J. Meaney  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 41,990